

MARINOS AND THE PURPOSE OF *PRIOR ANALYTICS* II*

NIKOS AGIOTIS

A short scholion on the purpose of *Prior Analytics* (hereafter *An. pr.*) II seems to be what has solely been transmitted to us of Marinus¹ (5th cent.) lost commentary on the aristotelian treatise. The excerpt has consistently claimed the attention of scholars, but has never been edited properly. In this paper we briefly refer to the pertinent manuscripts and the previous publications, and edit the scholion along with an English translation; furthermore, we examine the fragment's relation to two philosophical *opuscula* of Michael Psellos (1018 – † after 1075) and the commentary on the *An. pr.* of Leon Magentenos (12th cent.?).²

A.

The text is extant in two codices of the 13th cent., Par. gr. 1917³ (f. 160v, in

* I am grateful to Lutz Koch (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften) who carefully read the text, polishing my English and making suggestions.

¹ *Paulys Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* XIV/2, 1759-1767 s.v. "Marinus" (O. SCHISSEL); *Der Neue Pauly* VII, 899-900 s.v. "Marinus" (F. TINNEFELD); *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* IV, n. 42 s.v. "Marinus de Néapolis" (H. D. SAFFREY).

² We are currently preparing a critical edition of this text, which was first published by V. TRINCAVELLI in Venice (1536): *Ἰωάννου Γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Φιλοπόνου εἰς τὰ Πρότερα ἀναλυτικά τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους, ὑπόμνημα. Μαγεντηνοῦ σχόλια εἰς τὰ αὐτά. Σύνοψις περὶ τῶν συλλογισμῶν. Ioan. Gram. Philoponi comentaria [sic] in Priora analytica Aristotelis. Magentini comentaria [sic] in eadem. Libellus de syllogismis*. Privilegio Senatus Veneti cautum est, nequis hosce libros per decennium impune, aut imprimat, aut alibi impresos in hac civitate, vel aliis Veneto imperio subditis vendat, MDXXXVI. A digitized version of this book is provided by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek <<http://reader.digital-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10139780.html>>. For the history and the sources of the editio princeps, see also M. SICHERL, *Die griechischen Erstausgaben des Vettore Trincavelli (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Neue Folge. Monographien, V)*. Paderborn-Munich-Vienna-Zurich 1993, 58-61. For Leon's work and related bibliography, see *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy. Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, 684-685 s.v. "Leo Magentenos" (B. BYDÉN).

³ Cf. H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, II. Paris 1888, 162-163; M. CACOUROS, *Le Laur. 85.1. Témoin de l'activité conjointe d'un groupe de copistes travaillant dans la seconde moitié du XIII^e siècle*, in: G. PRATO (ed.),

marg. sup. = P) and Vat. gr. 245⁴ (f. 66v, in marg. sup. et int. = V). P contains commentaries and collections of scholia on the *Organon*, while V includes the logical treatises of Aristotle with the exception of the *Categories* and the *Sophistical Refutations* (hereafter *SE*), and pertinent scholia of Ioannes Philoponos (ca. 490-575) and Leon Magentenos. In P, the Marinos excerpt and three anonymous scholia, which also served as introductory material to *An. pr.*, were copied in the margins around a commentary on *An. pr. II*, which has been attributed to Philoponos.⁵ Except for one missing anonymous scholion, the same group was written in slightly different order around the same commentary in V. The text of the excerpt is short and no decisive conclusion regarding the relation between the two manuscripts can be adduced from the few existing variants. Perhaps the lectio brevior of V at the very beginning of the Marinos scholion⁶ could be an indication that P depends on the Vatican manuscript: V displays only a cursory reference as to the content of the scholion and its author, while P offers a more elaborate introduction. Chr. Brandis published an incomplete text of the scholion by using P as his exemplar; he had considered the scholion to be the last part of a larger chunk which comprised the anonymous scholia and the excerpt of Marinos.⁷ In his *Supplementum Praefationis* to the edition of Philoponos' commentary, M. Wallies added some of the missing parts without, however, giving a full text either.⁸ In the introduction to the recent edition of Marinos' *Vita Procli*,

I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca (Cremona, 4-10 Ottobre 1998). Florence 2000, 302-310.

⁴ Cf. I. MERCATI – P. F. DE' CAVALIERI, *Codices Vaticani Graeci, I. Codices 1-329*. Rome 1923, 317-319.

⁵ M. WALLIES, Ioannis Philoponi In Aristotelis Analytica priora commentaria (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, XIII/2). Berlin 1905, 387-485. In less than eight printed lines the editor expresses his doubts regarding Philoponos as the author of the scholia [WALLIES, *Philop. In Anal. pr.* (note 5), vi]. His arguments could be briefly restated thus: (a) the length of the commentary on book II is three times less than that on book I; (b) the vocabulary is more restricted and (c) the exegetical level is notably inferior in the scholia on book II compared to those on book I. There is, however, no serious study that either supports or disproves this assumption, while confusion regarding the matter has become quite common in the related bibliography. For the question of the authorship, see also S. EBBESEN, *Analysing Syllogisms or Anonymus Aurelianus III – the (presumably) Earliest Extant Latin Commentary on the Prior Analytics and its Greek Model. Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin* 37 (1981) 9-10: "... in Byzantine times, no ancient commentary on *APr. II* had been preserved ... The CAG edition of Philoponus reflects the manuscript situation by letting a Byzantine collection of scholia on Book II follow Philoponus' on book I".

⁶ See apparatus criticus below.

⁷ CHR. BRANDIS, *Scholia in Aristotelem*. Berlin 1836, 188a 46-b1.

⁸ WALLIES, *Philop. In Anal. pr.* (note 5), xxviii.

the editors quote the text of Brandis and add a French translation,⁹ but use the edition of Wallies as bibliographical reference; they do observe, however, that a different ending of the scholion is reported in the description of V in the pertinent manuscript catalogue.¹⁰

Ἔτι περὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ· Μαρίνου

5 Νῦν τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς σοφιστικῆς καὶ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς παραδίδωσιν· ὥς γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἔχει πρὸς τὴν ἀποδεικτικὴν, οὕτως καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν διαλεκτικὴν καὶ σοφιστικὴν· τὸ γὰρ πρῶτον ὥς ἀληθὴ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα συνάγον σύμφωνόν ἐστιν ἀποδείξει, τὸ δὲ νῦν προκείμενον διαλεκτικῇ ἀρμόζει θεωρίᾳ· καὶ γὰρ διδάσκει τί συνάγεται ἐκ ψευδῶν προτάσεων, περὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀντικειμένου παραλογισμοῦ, περὶ τοῦ ποσαχῶς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ αἰτεῖσθαι, περὶ τῆς κύκλῳ δείξεως, περὶ ἐπαγωγῆς, καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν.

5-6 διδάσκει τί συνάγεται ἐκ ψευδῶν προτάσεων] cf. An. pr. 53b 26-57b 17 6 περὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀντικειμένου παραλογισμοῦ] cf. An. pr. 64b 15-27 6-7 περὶ τοῦ ποσαχῶς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ αἰτεῖσθαι] cf. An. pr. 64b 28-66a 15 7 περὶ τῆς κύκλῳ δείξεως] cf. An. pr. 57b 18-59a 31 7 περὶ ἐπαγωγῆς] cf. An. pr. 68b 15-37

1 Ἔτι περὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ· Μαρίνου] περὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ τοῦ παρόντος βιβλίου, ὁ μαρίνος πάντων ἀληθέστατα λέγων φησὶν ὅτι P 4-8 τὸ γὰρ ... πολλῶν om. Brandis 5-8 καὶ ... πολλῶν om. Wallies 7 τὸ] τί P

Furthermore, on the purpose, taken from Marinos

Now he is explaining the principles of sophistic and dialectic reasoning; for as the first book relates to the demonstration, just so does this one relate to dialectic and sophistic reasoning; for the first book, since it infers from true and necessary things, is in agreement with demonstration, but the present one fits with dialectical theory; for he teaches what is inferred from false premises, about the fallacy which derives from opposite premises, about the number of the ways of asking for the initial point, about the circular proof, about induction, and also about many other things.

⁹ H. D. SAFFREY – A. PH. SEGONDS, *Marinus, Proclus ou sur le bonheur*. Paris 2001, xxxv, footnote 1.

¹⁰ SAFFREY – SEGONDS, *Marinus* (note 9), xxviii; MERCATI – CAVALIERI, *Codices* (note 4), 318.

B.

According to W. D. Ross, “the structure of the second book is by no means so clear as that of the first”.¹¹ This statement is admittedly right, since the content of book II more than often leaves the reader under the impression that it is either a collection of notes, or an examination of issues which have been raised or even exhaustively examined elsewhere in the *Organon*.¹² This content overlap resulted in controversies among the interpretators of the Aristotelian work regarding the purpose of the book.¹³

Marinos deems that Aristotle’s intention in the *An. pr.* II is to investigate the principles of *dialectic* and *sophistic reasoning* (vv. 2-4), but later he somewhat ambiguously implies that they are both parts of the *dialectical theory* (vv. 5). This opinion is of particular interest, because it is not to be found in any known commentary on the *An. pr.* and probably for the first connects the *purpose* of book II with the *SE*.¹⁴

However, it is perhaps possible to trace the scholion’s influence in two philosophical *opuscula* of Psellos: *Περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου τῶν Προτέρων ἀναλυτικῶν*¹⁵ and *Περὶ ἐρωτήματος διαλεκτικοῦ καὶ περὶ διαλεκτικῆς*.¹⁶

Marinos	Psellos
<p>Νῦν τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς σοφιστικῆς καὶ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς παραδίδωσιν</p> <p>schol., v. 2</p>	<p>σκοπὸς οὖν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ παραδοῦναι τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς σοφιστικῆς καὶ διαλε- κτικῆς</p> <p>Duffy, Pselli Philosophica (note 15), opusc. 11.3-4</p>

¹¹ W. D. ROSS, *Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀναλυτικά*. Aristotle’s Prior and Posterior Analytics. Oxford 1949, 4.

¹² R. SMITH, Aristotle. Prior Analytics. Indianapolis–Cambridge 1989, xiv-xv.

¹³ See, e.g., M. WALLIES, Alexandri In Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I commentarium (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, II/1). Berlin 1883, 6.13-31, 9.5-6; M. WALLIES, Ammonii In Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I commentarium (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, IV/6). Berlin 1899, 4.27-35; WALLIES, Philop. In Anal. pr. (note 5), 6.2, 10.6-12, 388.4-6; L. G. WESTERINK, Elias on the Prior Analytics. *Mnemosyne* 14 (1961) 138.23-24, 139.12-14

¹⁴ Cf. *SE*, 167b 8-9, 167b 21-36, 168b 22-26, 174a 35-37, 179b 23-26.

¹⁵ J. M. DUFFY, Michaelis Pselli Philosophica minora, I. Opuscula logica, physica, allegorica, alia. Stuttgart–Leipzig 1992, opusc. 11.

¹⁶ DUFFY, Pselli Philosophica (note 15), opusc. 13.

τὸ γὰρ πρῶτον ὡς ἀληθῆ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα συνάγον σύμφωνόν ἐστιν ἀποδείξει,

τὸ δὲ νῦν προκείμενον διαλεκτικῇ ἀρμόζει θεωρίᾳ

schol., vv. 4-5

ὁ δὲ γε Ἀριστοτέλης τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀληθῶν καὶ οἰκείων τῷ προκειμένῳ καὶ πρώτων καὶ γονιμωτέρων δεικνύναι καὶ συνάγειν τὸ προκείμενον συλλογισμοῦ ἀποδεικτικοῦ τίθεται· τὸ δὲ δι' ἐνδόξων συλλογίζεσθαι διαλεκτικόν, φησί, καὶ διαλεκτικὴν ἀκολουθῶς τὴν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων συλλογιστικὴν· τὴν δὲ ἐκ φαινομένων ἐνδόξων συλλογίζομένην σοφιστικὴν.

Duffy, Pselli Philosophica (note 15), opusc. 13.35-40

The first work by Psellos is a synopsis of *An. pr.* II, which barely changes the wording of the aristotelian text.¹⁷ The references to *sophistic* and *dialectic reasoning* make it plausible that the Byzantine scholar might have known the text of Marinos. In the second work of Psellos, the not so clear concept of a *dialectical theory* in Marinos seems to have been replaced by means of a formulation that attributes *generally accepted opinions* (ἐνδοξα) to *dialectic*, and *opinions which seem to be generally accepted* (φαινόμενα ἐνδοξα) to *sophistic reasoning*.

At any rate, the material for Psellos' formulation derives from the *Topics* (hereafter *Top.*) and the *SE*. In the first treatise, Aristotle argues that the *dialectical syllogism* (διαλεκτικὸς συλλογισμός) reasons from *generally accepted opinions*:

πρῶτον οὖν ρητέον τί ἐστι συλλογισμός καὶ τίνες αὐτοῦ διαφοραί, ὅπως ληφθῇ ὁ διαλεκτικὸς συλλογισμός· τοῦτον γὰρ ζητοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν προκειμένην πραγματείαν ... διαλεκτικὸς δὲ συλλογισμός ὁ ἐξ ἐνδόξων συλλογιζόμενος ... ἐριστικὸς δ' ἐστὶ συλλογισμός ὁ ἐκ φαινομένων ἐνδόξων, μὴ ὄντων δὲ ... (*Top.*, 100a 21-b 25)

In the *SE*, *opinions which seem to be generally accepted* are examined in relation to the *contentious argument* (ἐριστικὸς λόγος):

Ἔστι δὴ τῶν ἐν τῷ διαλέγεσθαι λόγων τέτταρα γένη, διδασκαλικοὶ καὶ διαλεκτικοὶ καὶ πειραστικοὶ καὶ ἐριστικοί ... περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἀποδεικτικῶν ἐν τοῖς Ἀναλυτικοῖς εἴρηται, περὶ δὲ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν καὶ πειραστικῶν ἐν

¹⁷ DUFFY, Pselli Philosophica (note 15), opusc. 11.4-85. For the use of synopsis as a way to interpret Aristotle in Byzantium, see P. GOLITSIS, Αρχαίο ελληνικό και βυζαντινό φιλοσοφικό υπόμνημα: ζητήματα συνέχειας και ασυνέχειας. *Υπόμνημα* 6 (2007) 202-203.

τοῖς ἄλλοις· περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀγωνιστικῶν καὶ ἐριστικῶν νῦν λέγωμεν. (SE, 165a 38-b 11)

Let us now turn to the commentary of Magentenos on *An. pr.* II; here, Leon mentions Marinos *expressis verbis* as a source:

ὁ δὲ Μαρῖνος σκοπὸν ἔχειν ἐνταῦθα εἶπε διαλαβεῖν περὶ τῶν λυσιτελούντων εἰς τὴν διαλεκτικὴν. τίνα δὲ εἰσι ταῦτα; τὸ ἐκ ψευδῶν προτάσεων ἀληθὲς συνάγειν συμπέρασμα, τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ αἰτεῖσθαι, ἢ ἐπαγωγὴ καὶ ἄλλα τινά.¹⁸

The relation to Marinos is obvious. Could Magentenos have had access to a better text than the one transmitted by P and V?¹⁹ Had someone wanted to put the reference to the *circular proof* in its proper place, this would have been right after the reference to the conclusion which is inferred by false premises, and most certainly not before the *induction* as is the case in Marinos' fragment, where the order of the sections in *An. pr.* II is presented as follows:²⁰ 53b 26-57b 17, 63b 23-64b 27, 64b 28-66a 15, **57b 18-59a 31**, 68b 15-37. It is remarkable that the *circular proof* is absent from the text of Magentenos. We cannot exclude the possibility that this is a mere omission on behalf of Leon; we are led to assume, however, that the evidence of Magentenos might indicate a later addition to the text of Marinos itself as transmitted by the scholia. In the synopsis of Psellos, the question regarding the proper place of the sections would most likely never have been raised, since Michael sums up the whole of *An. pr.* II. In the text of Leon, we do not find any reference to *sophistic* reasoning either, but this could be due to his silent consent to the subsumption of both *sophistic* and *dialectic reasoning* under *dialectical theory* in the scholion of Marinos; in this case no special reference to *sophistic reasoning* would be required. Interestingly, this hypothesis is justified by a passage of Leon on the *Top.*, where the scholar remarks similarly to Psellos the following:

¹⁸ The scholion that contains this testimonium derives from the codex Vat. gr. 244 and has been published by EBBESEN, *Analysing Syllogisms* (note 5), 10-11; we have changed the punctuation in a few occasions.

¹⁹ EBBESEN, *Analysing Syllogisms* (note 5), 10 n. 2. The author takes into consideration the text of P. He notes the striking similarities between the text of Magentenos and the respective scholion of Philoponos or Pseudo-Philoponos on *An. pr.* II and thinks that the reference to Marinos must be a later addition in the source of Leon: Magentenos "cannot have had access to the books his scholium refers to" [EBBESEN, *Analysing Syllogisms* (note 5), 11]. However, Magentenos could have known the isolated scholion of Marinos; access to the whole commentary is of course not a necessary condition for the reference to Marinos.

²⁰ Bold letters: reference to the section regarding the *circular proof*; see also the *apparatus fontium* under the edition of the scholion of Marinos.

“Υλη δὲ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς ἐστὶν αἱ ἔνδοξοι προτάσεις· τῶν δὲ ἐνδόξων προτάσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπολύτως λέγονται ἔνδοξοι, αἱ καὶ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς εἰσιν· ... αἱ δὲ τῶν ἐνδόξων προτάσεων εἰσι φαινόμεναι ἔνδοξοι ... περὶ ταύτας ἡ σοφιστικὴ καταγίνεται.”²¹

Although, according to the state of our knowledge, this scenario remains only a possibility, there is an important lesson to learn: Byzantine commentators partly built their exegeses from scholia scattered in the various manuscripts available in their time, and the evidence provided by them may hark back to a tradition which antedates that of the extant scholia themselves. In any case, the interrelation of Byzantine commentaries and the “independent” tradition of scholia has to be carefully studied.

Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina (CAGB)
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften

ABSTRACT

This article includes a critical edition of a scholion attributed to the neoplatonic philosopher Marinus and some remarks regarding its possible relation to texts of Michael Psellos and Leon Magentenos.

²¹ S. KOTZABASSI, *Byzantinische Kommentatoren der aristotelischen Topik*. Johannes Italos & Leon Magentinos (*Εταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Ερευνῶν*, 17). Thessalonike 1999, 112.49-68.

